



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Glotta III, 92. The translation of *μεταθυσάτῳ* as "offer in place of" is not open to Keramopoulos' just criticism of Homolle's "renew." The "elliptical genitive" construction of *ἐς τοῦ δρόμου*, which, to say the least, is not so easily defended as was the same construction with a proper name, as under the former reading *ἐς* [Ῥ]υδρόμου, is now avoided. The crucial point is the *ἐς* itself. The Delphian dialect regularly has *ἐν* with accusative, and this supposed *ἐς* "into" has been a solitary and puzzling anomaly (cf. *Class. Phil.* II, p. 264 with references, and my *Greek Dialects* No. 50, note), which we are happily rid of if we take *ἐς*=*ἐκ*. If it is said that this is only to exchange one anomaly for another, since *ἐς*=*ἐκ* has also been hitherto unknown in Delphian, the answer is: The distribution of *ἐν* with accusative and *εἰς* (*ἐς*, *ἐνς*) is clean cut; no dialect has both types except where external influence is involved, and then, barring a few examples of Aetolian *ἐν* in late Doric inscriptions, it is the *εἰς*, due to Attic influence, which appears later. On the other hand, while four dialects have regularly *ἐς*=*ἐκ*, there are also some which have traces of *ἐς*, though usually showing *ἐκ* or *ἐξ*.¹ Cf. my *Greek Dialects* § 100 with *α*, where Delph. *ἔργονος* is quoted with a query. This reading in the Labyadae inscription C45, which Solmsen *Inscr. select.* gives after Nikitskij, I had not ventured, in the face of previous readings, to regard as certain, but a subsequent inspection of the stone has convinced me that it is beyond any doubt, and indeed it seems clear enough in the photograph published in *B.C.H.* XIX.

CARL DARLING BUCK

PLAUTUS *MERCATOR* 59: *convicium* OR *coniurium*?

The readings of the *Itala recensio* are generally regarded as having the value of conjectural emendations; in the present passage one of them has proved so acceptable that, so far as I know, it has appeared in all editions of Plautus from the *princeps* down to the present day in spite of contradictory evidence in the Palatine MSS. No doubt early editors regarded it as having the value of an independent reading, and even in the present century some may hold to this view. However this may be, I think that *convicium* should disappear from our verse in future editions of the *Mercator*.

Charinus, in the prologue, is telling the story of an early love affair and consequent trouble with his father; the *leno importunus* made ducks and drakes of the hard-earned wealth of the boy's father; the father in indignant mutterings, as reported by Charinus, expressed his disgust that

convicium tot me annos jam se pascere

For *convicium* of the Italian recension, B gives *coniurium*, CD give *conuirium* (which is obviously a mere miswriting of the reading in B). The early

¹ How far this is due to difference in the character of the following sound, and how far the *ἐκ* is due to external influence, is not wholly determinable. *ἐς* probably arose before gutturals, but whether it anywhere remained restricted to this position is doubtful.

editors (cf. the notes of Lambinus, Pareus, and Camerarius) interpret *convicium* as meaning "disgrace," an equivalent of *opprobrium*, and in default of evidence (but cf. Ussing *ad loc.*), I assume that modern editors so take it. It is, however, clear that *convicium* in Latin is not a synonym of *opprobrium*. The *Thesaurus s.v.* shows that the word connotes noise, and Plautine usage regularly brackets it with phrases referring to abusive talk, with *male precatur* (*Merc.* 235), with *clamorem facere* (*Bacch.* 874); the context of *Most.* 617 depicts a wrangle between debtor and creditor; it may be added that elsewhere in Plautus the word appears only in the phrase *facere convicium*. If the word is possible in our verse it could only be used metonymously in the sense of "a noisy wrangler" as Ovid used it of magpies, *nemorum convicia picae* (*Metam.* v. 676). May it not mean that in our verse? Hardly, for Charinus has just described himself as carrying on his affair, especially the mercenary side of it, in secret (*res exsulatum ad illam clam* [MSS *iam*] *abibat patris*, 43); it is the father who, on discovering the truth, becomes noisy (45-49).

Under these circumstances should we not read *coniurium*, for which I maintain the evidence of the Palatine MSS is unanimous? The indignant father naturally supposes that the boy and the *leno importunus* are conspiring grafters robbing him of his fortune. We shall then be introducing a new word into the language; for *coniurius* will be a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον. As such, *coniurius* will hardly be more suspicious than *munem* in vs. 105 of this same prologue, although the latter word has the advantage of two notices in Latin lexicographers. I can see no impropriety in the form or meaning of *coniurius*, but I must defer to specialists on this point. For their consideration I submit the following:

iniurus	iniurius	*iniurium	*iniuro	(Late Latin in peculiar sense but note <i>iniuriatum</i> in Lucilius acc. to Cichorius, <i>Unters. zu Lucilius</i> , p. 239).
periurus	*periurius	periurium	periuro	
*coniurus	coniurius (?)	*coniurium	coniuro	

The adjective *iniurius* and the substantive *periurium* seem to me to justify sufficiently the formation of an adjective *coniurius*, here used as a substantive. Once (*As.* 318) Plautus uses *coniuratus* in the sense we require for *coniurius*; except for the aversion to an ictus falling on the last syllable of a spondaic word-ending, one might better read *coniuratum* in our verse than the undeservedly popular *convicium*. It is to be regretted in any case that the *Thesaurus* has no lemma, *coniurius*, which the reading of BCD would justify even if my plea for it in the text should not be convincing; the editor of the *Lexicon Plautinum* rightly gives the word a place.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT